

MSR Stakeholder Working Group
Orange/Villa Park/Orange Sphere of Influence
August 13, 2004
Meeting Notes

The meeting began shortly after 10:00 am.

Public Comment:

There was no request from the public to speak.

Agenda/Desired Outcomes:

The facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda and desired outcomes as follows:

- Technical Brainstorming Committee (TBC) reports
- Feedback, discussion, TBC report refinements, if any
- Identification of consensus TBC recommendations, if any

Working Group Comments:

Some SWG members requested further clarification of the purpose of the MSR Stakeholder Working Group, the MSR focus area vision process, role of stakeholders and how they all relate to LAFCO. It was reiterated by LAFCO staff that the purpose is to work with the key stakeholders in the focus area to help generate the technical data necessary to make the nine determinations required by the MSR. Also, the purpose is to provide the focus area stakeholders with the opportunity to vision what they believe should be addressed over the next 20 years within their focus area. (The issues outlined in the SWG vision plan may or may not address the nine determinations required by the MSR.) Subsequent to completing the SWG Vision Report LAFCO staff will prepare its MSR report. The MSR report with the SWG Vision Report as an attachment will be submitted to the LAFCO Commission for its consideration.

Technical Brainstorm Committee Presentations:

Members of the four macro issue subcommittees presented their final reports in the areas of:

- Unincorporated Areas Governance and Fiscal
- Open Space & Recreation
- Septic Sewer Conversion
- Water/Waste Water/Urban Runoff

The following is a summary of each macro issue report, SWG comments, if any and SWG recommendations.

■ **Unincorporated Areas Governance and Fiscal:**

Problem statement:

- ♦ The County is and will continue to experience unprecedented growth
- ♦ Growth increases the demand for and impact to public service delivery and governance
- ♦ The current service delivery structure - County as municipal service provider to "islands" is costly and inefficient

- ♦ As the population grows, the need for regional services increases, the ability for the County to maintain the existing level of both regional and municipal-level services will likely be compromised

Options, alternatives, future strategies:

- 1. North Tustin unincorporated area governance & service delivery:**
 - Remain unincorporated:
 - Spheres of influence for Tustin & Orange retracted – “0” SOI for NT
 - CSA or CSD created to fund services
 - Annex to Tustin
 - Annex to Tustin & Orange
- 2. OPA unincorporated area governance & service delivery:**
 - Remain unincorporated
 - Form CSA or CSD to help fund sewer infrastructure & other services
 - Access other funding sources for sewer construction & connection
 - Annex to Orange
- 3. Explore regionalized service delivery approach for municipal service provision**
 - Reduces/eliminates duplication of service delivery efforts
 - May achieve economies of scale through collaborative efforts
 - Encourage dialogue among service providers to identify potential service delivery efficiencies &/or cost-saving options
- 4. Establish a process for opening up conversation regarding *voluntary* annexation**
 - Outreach/Education workplan
 - Focus on resident concerns
 - Demystify Annexation
 - Identify resident issues & concerns
 - Form Task Force
 - Resident working committees
 - Staff liaisons
 - City
 - County
 - LAFCO
 - Advisory to policy makers
- 5. Revisit “Unincorporated County Islands Revitalization Strategic Plan”**
 - Identify funding sources for island infrastructure upgrades
 - Identify opportunities to create alternative service delivery funding mechanisms & governance options for potential long-term unincorporated areas
 - Encourage dialogue regarding annexation – resident initiated

- Prioritize annexation of all remaining “small” & uninhabited “large” island areas to the City of Orange

SWG Comments:

1. Addition: Incorporation as a potential approach for both North Tustin and OPA unincorporated areas
2. Addition: Revisit master property tax agreements as a way to open up dialogue between cities and county regarding annexation
3. Addition: Address funding for ongoing code enforcement issues in unincorporated areas
4. Addition: Address resident land use concerns-zoning consistency
5. Look at effects on other areas as a result of changes to unincorporated areas
6. Key to making changes (identified in strategies & approaches):
 - Funding
 - Education of residents

SWG Recommendation:

The SWG, by consensus, approved the Unincorporated Areas Governance and Fiscal report with the inclusion of the six additions listed by the SWG and agreed that it should become part of the SWG Vision Plan.

■ Open Space & Recreation:

Problem-Challenges:

- Environmental:
 - Urban runoff
 - Fire management (area closures)
 - Public access management
- Financing – identifying sources for funding

Options, alternatives, future strategies:

- Explore the potential of special districts:
 - Open Space District
 - Community Services District
 - Utilize existing districts
 - Propose a new district
- Participate in County-wide open space planning
- Create partnerships

SWG Comments:

Excellent report

SWG Recommendation:

The SWG by consensus approved the Open Space & Recreation report and agreed that it should become part of the SWG Vision Plan.

■ Septic-Sewer Conversion

Problem-Challenges:

- Increased population and densities are putting pressure on septic systems as a viable method of wastewater disposal for the future
- Conversion is costly
 - Infrastructure does not exist in many areas
 - Accessing public funding for infrastructure construction is time consuming & competitive

Options, alternatives, future strategies:

- 1. Make Public Sewer Infrastructure Widely Available**
- 2. Access Funding Sources for Infrastructure Costs Pursue more proactive monitoring practices**
- 3. Pursue Financing Opportunities for Infrastructure – Conversion Costs**
 - Grants /Loans:
 - Multi-party economies of scale
 - Assessment Districts – Bonds secured by lien on properties- paid off in installments. Cost shared by property owners w/in district
 - Other Financing Mechanisms- Cost shared by property owners
- 6. Education & Outreach - Focus on increasing resident awareness**
 - Septic system use & maintenance
 - Environmental/water quality requirements
 - Build on existing education/awareness programs
- 7. Inform/Educate Policy makers of regulatory, environmental, public health changes**
 - Create new/support current stakeholder groups of involved parties
- 8. Strengthen or Create New Proactive Policies and Practices**
 - Require regular testing
 - Septic Offset Program
 - Active Monitoring & Assessment Methodology

SWG Comments:

None noted

SWG Recommendation:

The SWG by consensus approved the Septic-Sewer Conversion report and agreed that it should become part of the SWG Vision Plan.

Water/Wastewater/Urban Runoff

The Water/Wastewater/Urban Runoff TBC elected not to do as the other macro issue TBC's had done and it did not include a problem-challenges list or list of brainstormed options, strategies or alternatives. As an alternative, the TBC identified the following:

"Key Policy Principles":

- The evaluation of appropriate service providers should be confined to the East Orange development area. The application of this question to a broader area should be deferred to a future study.

- The evaluation process should be stakeholder driven and the primary stakeholders need to participate collaboratively in an objective evaluation to determine the best service provision(s) for the East Orange development area.
- Key evaluative criteria should be adopted to:
 - 1) Provide objective evaluative criteria to direct the stakeholders' efforts, and;
 - 2) Assist both the stakeholders and the MSR Working Group better understand and utilize the information that will be provided by the Technical Advisory Committee.

“Key Challenges”:

- The primary stakeholders should meet to complete the evaluation that leads to identifying the most appropriate provider(s) of water, wastewater, and urban runoff services in the East Orange development area.
- The study being completed by the Technical Advisory Committee should be integrated into the efforts of the primary stakeholders group. A closer working relationship between those two groups should be established.
- The determination of the appropriate service provider(s) should be reached, and any necessary jurisdictional changes should be accomplished, in a time frame that will accommodate the proposed development schedule in the East Orange area.

The Water/Wastewater/Urban Runoff TBC members requested additional time to carry on discussions. Committee members were not certain if they would generate a future-focused problem-challenges list and corresponding brainstorming list of options, alternatives and/or strategies. Members of the committee indicated that currently they are interested in exploring an East Orange solution as opposed to identifying a range of potential alternatives or strategies.

SWG Comments:

- Give the committee more time to put together a simple list of core issue problems and to brainstorm a list of potential options, strategies and approaches to change.
- In all fairness to the entire SWG, it is important not to extend the meeting schedule beyond the working group's agreed-upon schedule/scope.

Follow up items:

- Water/Wastewater/Urban Runoff report
- Draft Vision Plan

Adjournment

The meeting concluded and was adjourned shortly after 1:30 pm.